The Spirit knows not; yet knowing not, he knows. For the energy that dwelt in knowing cannot cease, because it is everlasting. —*Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 56 OCTOBER, 1968 NUMBER 12

"SIGNS OF THE CYCLE"

> Today, the Spirit in man has returned like King Lear, from seeming insanity to its senses; and, raising its voice, it now speaks in those authoritative tones to which men of old have listened in reverential silence through incalculable ages, until deafened by the din and roar of civilization and culture, they could hear it no longer . . . .
>
> —H. P. BLAVATSKY, "The Tidal Wave"

STUDENTS sometimes wonder why H.P.B. devoted so much criticism to the claims of the Darwinists, who were, after all, champions of the great principle of Evolution. She often praised the emancipating spirit of modern science, and if the biological conceptions of the evolutionists fell short of the implication of the occult teachings, was this not excusable, in view of the long absence of the Wisdom-Religion in the West?

Reading *The Secret Doctrine* carefully, one sees that it is not so much the shortcomings of scientific theory to which Madame Blavatsky objected, as the assumption of confident *authority* on the part of so many of its champions. What progress could there be for mankind itself, if the iconoclastic theories of science brought only a new dispensation of belief, displacing the old faith in religion? This would be, so far as the great majority of the people were concerned, only a "palace revolution," a change in names and forms, with little alteration in the habits of mind which determine how human beings think of themselves.

While in every great historical transition there is no doubt an increment of progress, those prime requisites of human growth, the development of self-reliance and a sense of responsibility, are poorly served by "reforms" which place the decisive forces affecting human destiny outside human beings themselves—and the claims of the materialists, Darwinists included, have certainly had this effect. H.P.B. wrote emphatically on this point (*S.D.* II, 689):

> The pendulum of thought oscillates between extremes. Having now finally emancipated herself from the shackles of theology, Science has embraced the opposite fallacy; and in the attempt to interpret Nature on purely materialistic lines, she has built up that most extravagant theory of the ages—the derivation of man from a ferocious and brutal ape. So rooted has this doctrine, in one form or another, now become, that the most Herculean efforts will be needed to bring about its final rejection. The Darwinian anthropology is the incubus of the ethnologist, a sturdy child of modern Materialism, which has grown up and acquired increasing vigour, as the ineptitude of the theological legend of Man's "creation" became more and more apparent. It has thriven on account of the strange delusion that—as a scientist of repute puts it—"All hypotheses and theories with respect to the rise of man can be reduced to *two* (the Evolutionist and the Biblical exoteric account) . . . There is no other hypothesis conceivable. . . ."!! The anthropology of the secret volumes is, however, the best possible answer to such a worthless contention.

At issue, here, is the crucial matter of access to self-knowledge. People who suppose themselves to be the descendants of "a ferocious and brutal ape" are likely to resist with all the rationalizing devices of lower manas, not only the humanizing ethics of such teachers as Buddha and Jesus, but also the higher intimations of their own inner nature, the voice of conscience and the intuitions which dimly penetrate, now and then, the dark pall of Kali Yuga. Contrast, for example, what H.P.B. says of the psychological environment of the early Third Race (*S.D.* II, 272-73), shaped by the presence of those who were both spiritual ancestors and teachers, with the materializing influences that became inevitable through the harsh polemics of the Darwinists. One of the most uncompromising passages in *The Secret Doctrine* is addressed to this problem. H.P.B. speaks first of those open-minded scientists who will not pretend to know more than they have found out, then turns to the would-be "authorities":

> We, Theosophists, would willingly bow before such men of learning as the late Prof. Balfour Stewart, Messrs. Crookes,

> Quatrefages, Wallace, Agassiz, Butlerof, and several others, though we may not agree, from the stand-point of esoteric philosophy, with all they say. But nothing could make us consent to even a show of respect for the opinions of other men of science, such as Hæckel, Carl Vogt, or Lidwig Büchner, in Germany; or even of Mr. Huxley and his co-thinkers in materialism in England—the colossal erudition of the first named, notwithstanding. Such men are simply the intellectual and moral murderers of future generations; especially Hæckel, whose crass materialism often rises to the height of idiotic naïvetés in his reasonings. (II, 651.)

We, who live in a time of agonizing harvest from the seeds of materialism planted in the nineteenth century, can see nothing extreme in this indictment. It is a natural passage from a childhood instructed, for knowledge of the human past, not in mythic heroes, but shambling, club-wielding, half-human monsters, to a manhood which sees nothing atavistic or wrong in a national policy which relies wholly on instruments of destruction for assurance of "peace," and refers casually to the "struggle for existence" as ethical justification for the ultimate destructiveness of nuclear war-heads. Meanwhile the subtler aspects of materialism give support to the doctrine of "conditioning" in education, which becomes, in practice, a licence to manipulate through suggestion, and even by the use of drugs, the plastic material of the human psyche.

The struggles now going on in the various branches of science can also be traced to the fundamental question of the nature of man. The objection of humanistic biologists to the enthusiasm for DNA; the ethical as well as physiological questioning of medical organ-transplanters by thoughtful physicians; the cries of ecologists against the shame and horror of a planet ravaged by men with no feeling of reverence for Nature—the confusion about, as well as the exploitation of, the meaning of the "spiritual"—all these phenomena are part of the great struggle which continues from the nineteenth century, and will surely reach a new climax in the twentieth. It concerns the nature of man.

It is hardly an accident that "the quest for identity" is now a commonplace made popular by students of broad psychological tendencies. Such wonderings about the self, emerging in a period of racial, national, and ideological turbulence and revolt, belong to the cycle of awakening spoken of by H.P.B. in both *The Secret Doctrine* and her *Five Messages* to the American Theosophists, just

as do the other precipitations she speaks of, and which are now apparent on every hand. But can we now repeat, without further qualification, the hardy prophecy made by H.P.B. in "The Tidal Wave"? She wrote in 1889:

> If the signs of the times can be trusted it is not the *Animalists* who will remain conquerors. This is warranted us by the many brave and prolific authors and writers who have arisen of late to defend the rights of Spirit to reign over matter. Many are the honest, aspiring Souls now raising themselves like a dead wall against the torrent of the muddy waters of Materialism. And facing the hitherto dominating flood which is still carrying off into unknown abysses the fragments from the wreck of the dethroned, cast down Human Spirit, they now command: "So far hast thou come; but thou shalt go no further!"

Well, if the times have in some ways changed for the worse since 1889, presenting in full maturity the ugly forces of materialism, it can also be said that the claims of the animalists no longer display a youthful vigor. For a great many of the coming generation, the assertions of scientific materialism have no more authority than any other tired cliché from a betraying past. The youth of the present epoch are far more inclined to consult themselves for their conceptions of self-knowledge and for guidance in what they must do. This is the universal report from sensitive teachers and other elders who have close contact with the young.

At the same time, the great anthropological issue of the late nineteenth century—Darwinism, and its struggle with Churchianity—is now hardly argued at all. It has become virtually an "academic" question, by comparison with the stringent ethical decisions pressed upon every awakened member of the human race. So far as the race is concerned, the lines of intellectual influence leading to the present questioning are clear enough, reaching from Kierkegaard in the nineteenth century, with his insistence on personal integrity and his challenge to religious orthodoxy, to the twentieth-century existentialist thinkers, whose influences in awakening moral self-reliance and independent, individual responsibility has been immeasurable. Gandhian thought has also had a profound effect all over the world, and been amplified in strength by such distinguished leaders as Martin Luther King and Danilo Dolci. Even the old doctrines of anthropology are now being challenged, through the work of humanist scholars such as Lewis Mumford, whose latest book *The Myth of the Machine* points out that it is a materialist folly for students of

evolution to concern themselves mainly with early man's "tool-making" skills and propensities. The *mind* of ancient man, Mumford maintains, is a far more important index to his emerging humanity, revealing more essential truths concerning the human heritage.

It is true enough that, by comparison with the pure teachings of *The Secret Doctrine,* these lines of awakening thought are blurred with past misconceptions; but this is to be expected; the cycle itself imposes limitations. As H.P.B. has said (*S.D.* I, 326): "Outside of initiation—for every thinker there will be a 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther,' mapped out by his intellectual capacity, as clearly and as unmistakably as there is for the progress of any nation or race in its cycle by the law of Karma." Yet every age may obtain, through the merit of its karmic deserts, such enlightenment as may come from initiated teachers in the times of their appearance among men.

Just as in the 1860's, a few years before Madame Blavatsky inaugurated the great movement of the nineteenth century, the eve of that cycle presented widely differing phenomena of a mixed moral character, so today we have a similar situation—although in the present the *moral* aspect of the cycle is far more pronounced, and the feeling of an oncoming "moment of choice" much more deeply impressed upon the perceptive men of our time.

Students might do well to read again "The Tidal Wave," in order to renew its encouragements, and for help in recognizing hopeful signs of the sort that H.P.B. then pointed to. Such signs, we may think, will become increasingly apparent as the few remaining years of the interim cycle pass away.

ORGANIZED LIFE OF THE T.S.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS—It is now my duty to attempt to deal further with the subject of the Organized Life of the Theosophical Society. Brother Wright has taken up some points which I would have taken up in other circumstances; Brother Chakravarti has outlined to you as a Brahman, as a member of the Indian Section, what he thinks is the mission of the Theosophical Society and what its mission there so far has resulted in. You have had from Brother Wright a great deal of fact. . . . I think that you will believe him, that we have accomplished an enormous amount of work in eighteen years against most strenuous and bitter opposition. And it is the custom in America, and especially in the West, and most especially in Chicago, to measure results by money. How could we have accomplished all this, how could we have printed all those books without printing presses, without paper, without salaries, without people to do the work, and that you think takes money?

Perhaps you think we have a secret fund from which we have drawn some millions, laid away amongst the buried treasures of India, which one or two of us can draw from now and then, so as to enable us to do work which other bodies can accomplish only by the use of money. But it is not so. We have little money and never had much. We do not want it, do not expect it, and the day when we shall have a large fund and be able to collect $5,000,000 in imitation of Western missionary bodies will be the day when the Theosophical Society will die. It is not money that has done this. It is the energy of the human heart. These people who are here with me are only representatives of many, many persons all over the world who are willing to give their life, their energy, their time to a movement which they think will benefit man. They get nothing for it; they get no preference. What is it of honor to preside at a meeting like this? What is it for any person to be a member of a Branch? What is it to be the President of the Theosophical Society?

NOTE.—This article was one of Mr. Judge's addresses to the Theosophical Congress at the Parliament of Religions, Chicago's World Fair, September, 1893. It has been previously reprinted in THEOSOPHY.

Nothing at all. There is no honor in it whatever. There are no places, no salaries, nothing at all but work.

Brother Chakravarti gave you an idea of our future. It has been said against us that this movement of ours was an invention of the East, but he must have made you suspect that perhaps this movement is unique, that it came neither from the East nor from the West. The East has solidified, crystallized, stood still; it would never have commenced such a movement. The West did not know about such things; it did not want them. We are wrapped up in material progress, and never would have started such a movement. Where, then, was the movement really started? It was started in the spiritual world above both East and West, by living men. Not by spirits of dead men, but by living spirits, living spirits like yourselves, who have risen above creeds and nations and castes and peoples, and are simply human beings. They started this movement by giving the impulse and the message; that is why we who have been in it so long have the confidence born of knowledge, knowledge that it will succeed.

We began at the time under direction, when we knew that materialism was spreading, not only over the West, but insidiously all over the East. It was turning the mind of the East, not to Christianity—never could that be done—but into the grossest forms of materialism. That is to say, the West itself with its missionaries was corrupting a vast mass of men and turning them into men who believed in nothing but annihilation after this life. If you could have succeeded in converting them to Christianity, it would have been well enough, for then they could rise up higher into another spiritual life. But instead of succeeding with them in that, as I know from facts, from having been there, you were simply flinging them from their own beliefs into materialism, which the Theosophic Society was started to prevent, both there and in the West. It has done something—it has not been the one cause, but it has been the little lever, the little point in the centre, around which we are all working with all effectual means for the good of humanity. It is trying to offer the key to all these Congresses and to show all men where the truth is.

Now, when the Theosophical Society was founded in 1875 . . . there was nothing else but laughter and jokes. The Society was an immense joke, they said, a new kind of spiritualism, something of that sort to tickle men's fancies—and we have had that to contend

with all the time. But we have succeeded always in remaining at the post and saying just what we meant to say all the time for all the laughter. We took no salaries, but we had belief in the human heart.

The objects of the Theosophical Society having been explained to you, you know the Society has but one doctrine, that of Universal Brotherhood. You cannot belong to it unless you believe in that; you won't want to belong to it unless you believe in that. But you are not required to believe anything else. You are not required to believe in Brother Chakravarti; you are not required to believe what, as the newspapers say, are the doctrines of "that woman Besant"; you are not required to believe in Madame Blavatsky, who was a woman, a human being, just the same as the rest of us; you are not required to believe in those great beings of whom Brother Chakravarti has been speaking. It has been supposed by some that in order to be a Theosophist you must believe in Mahatmas, that you must believe in H. P. Blavatsky, in re-incarnation, in Karma; but you do not have to believe in any of those things at all. But, I take it, you must believe in Universal Brotherhood.

The reason why people have been a little confused is this: they have seen the Theosophical Society absolutely without a creed, absolutely without any dogma, and as inside of it they know of a large number of people who believe in those ideas and doctrines, they think that is what the Theosophist must believe. But it is not. For, don't you see, if we started a Universal Brotherhood, and started a Society to find out the truth, and then fixed a dogma, that moment we would be telling a lie and forfeiting the whole object we started to accomplish. We can never have a creed. We do not know what the truth is. It may be that we are wrong; it may be we will find out more. It is true we will never go back to those old dogmas and creeds, although there are still many members on the books of the powerful churches. We can never go back there, but we may go further on, and we are quite willing to.

We are promulgating our philosophies which we talk about as individuals, and on our own account. As Vice-President of the Society I have no right to say that any particular thing is true, and I never do say so. But I have the right to say, as I myself emphatically do, that I as an individual believe certain things are true, and I would be a poor sort of man if, believing certain things to be true, I did not try to show that they are. But at the same time I have no right to say, as man or official, you must believe it because I do. I

simply present it to you for your consideration, and it is for you to decide, not for me. I am not going to stop saying that I believe so-and-so because a few other persons cannot believe it. They can go on with me and we will agree to disagree, and we will only forward the cause of Universal Brotherhood.

Beliefs in particular creeds have nothing to do with how you treat another man. What creed is there in the statement republished by Jesus, promulgated by him, to do to others as you would have them do unto you? No creed about that; no paving of hell with the skulls of infants about that; no belief in a particular sort of transmission of the spiritual life from St. Peter or Paul in that; nothing at all to abridge the treatment of man and woman by man and woman in the way they should treat them. We have no creed, then, and we should have none.

But the question is often asked: What have you as an organization to do with labor, with legal questions, labor-saving forces, with education, with society? We have nothing to do with them. Is it not true that man, if he has a knowledge as to how he ought to live, needs no law whatever? Was not St. Paul right when he spoke of that and said you could become your own law; knowing the truth, you need no law. What, then, has the Theosophical Society to do with law? If there are to be laws, let them be passed and execute them, but the Theosophical Society has nothing to do with them as such. Every brother in the Theosophical Society must obey the law of the land in which he lives, for he would be a poor Theosophist if he did not. The Theosophical Society has nothing to do with education. Its members may have as much to do with it as they please, but they have no right to say what is the Theosophical Society's idea of education. They can only say "That is my idea of it." And always they must and shall preserve these distinctions.

We have been asked why we do not join the Bellamyites and other cooperative societies? If you want to go in, go in. The Theosophical Society, as such, has nothing to do with it. I am perfectly satisfied to live where I am and do my duty where I stand, without any new law of property, or with it, whichever you please. The religion of the West which logically ought to support all the various socialists and anarchists and nihilists is the Christian religion, because in the beginning it was communal. Jesus' system was a community in which everything was common property, and the early Christians threw all their money and property into one common

box. Why, then, should not the Christian religion logically carry out all the plans of the socialists, anarchists, nihilists, and all the other ists who want to change the face of the earth by legislation?

The Theosophist knows that legislation changes nothing whatever. There are laws now on every statute book in every State in the United States—laws enough, if men would only execute them and live up to them. But a law that socialists shall share in this, or that there shall be no Trust in that, is passed; and then there are the lawyers to get around the law, as they always can. So what is the use of passing the law at all? There is no use whatever. Hence the Theosophical Society, as such, has nothing to do with such trumpery and democratic things as legislation. Let the men engaged in legislation go on legislating. If a Theosophist is born to be a legislator, let him legislate as a citizen and not as a Theosophist, or if he is born to be a judge, let him be a judge and skilled lawyer. If they would know that philosophy which shows them what human life is, they will have begun to follow the law without knowing what the law is.

America is the only land of all countries where the law is followed without the people knowing much of it. In America the people are orderly; they understand life a little better than other people in the world, but they don't know so much about the masses of laws they have on their books. I believe personally that the day is coming when America is to be the country where the new race will be born that will know all about the true laws and what is right, and will be able to perform it. So, then, the Theosophical Society is not prepared to give out promulgations as to this or that particular item of legislation or education or civic affairs that people would have taught.

They ask also about marriage. Why, you understand about marriage. You know how it is accomplished. We have nothing to do with it as a Society. We know there are many kinds of marriage, sometimes merely by tying a string, sometimes by walking around the fire. As a body we have nothing to do with these forms nor interfere with them. And as to prayer, if you want to pray, pray. But if you pray, and if you say you have a certain belief, live up to it. If you do not do so you are no Theosophist, nor a man, nor a proper living person. You are only a hypocrite.

Now, the Theosophical Society is an unsectarian body. It does not have a creed. It never will have one if those persons in it now can possibly prevent it. It does not need a creed. It is open to

everybody, of all sects and faiths, and for that reason it has been possible to bring into it men of all religions, men from India, China, Japan, Brahmins—as you have seen and as you have already before your eyes, which could not have been accomplished by any sect, Christian, or Buddhist, or Brahman. If the Buddhists started in India a Buddhist society, the Brahmins would not accept it. And if the Brahmins started a Brahmin propagandist society, the Buddhists would say they did not want it. So it is with the various Christian denominations: the Baptists, the Catholics, the Methodists, the Presbyterians. If any one of them, as a society, asked others to come in, none of the other different stripes or classes of Christians would come in. Each says it teaches the truth; still the others do not come in.

Theosophy comes forward boldly and says: "All religions have underneath one single truth. None of the religions are perfectly true. It is impossible that they should be, because man is prone to err. Come into the Society in which as brothers helping each other we will examine all these faiths so that we may find out the truth under all. For we believe that in the beginning of human evolution great teachers gave the truth out—one single truth before the mingling of tongues on the tower of Babel—to man." That single truth was variously accepted and variously perceived, and out of these different perceptions they built up differing creeds, and so they made a great many different sorts of faiths. But suppose you look into all of them. You find the Christians teaching for many years that man has a soul. Do you think that the Christians are the only ones who taught about the soul? The Hindus have been teaching about the soul for ages. They have said always that man has a soul. The Japanese do the same thing. So do other races and religions. So in that one point they have always together been teaching the same thing.

The Christians have been teaching about heaven and hell; about a sort of heaven which is very material, I admit, with pearly gates and golden streets and angels with robes such as no one ever saw and crowns upon their heads; and hell full of fire and brimstone, with devils throwing people around with forks into the fire. The Buddhists have been teaching the same thing for ages. I can read to you out of their books about a copper vessel full of boiling oil into which they say fate puts a man. In this he goes down and down for thousands and thousands of years until he gets to the bottom;

then he begins to rise again to the top, rising for ages again, and when he gets to the top and thinks he is going to be let out, he begins to sink again, and that goes on for ages more. Is not that as bad and as material as the Christian hell? And then the Eastern teaching of heaven, of an inimitable and incomprehensible place, yet just as material but better than the Christian heaven.

The Abbé Huc went to Tartary many years ago. He was a Catholic priest. There he found ministers, monks, nuns, similar ceremonies to the Romish, the ministers using the different vestments and draperies of the Catholics, the taper, bell, candle, the book, the rosary, what not, everything. He brought back the tale to Europe and he published it. The explanations of the priests—of course they would not say so now—was that it was the invention of the Devil, who, knowing that Christianity was going to be abroad, went ahead of it and founded that imitation in the East so that Christian people would be confused. Well, now, that is not the way to explain it. The proper way is, that man has these things as a universal property and always makes some mistakes. And so it is in Buddhism and every other religion. In Tibet they have a pope who is the great successor of the original founder of the thing, just the same as the Catholic pope.

No matter what sort of Western religion you bring forward; the religions of the East are the older religions and the fountain, but there is a single stream of truth underneath all, and that single stream is what the Theosophical Society digs for and implores these religious men to find out. We ask them not to go before each other and say their own religion is the true one. But they ask if we can give mercy to a man's soul, wash away the blood from his hand, and take away his sin? We say, Come, we will wash away your sin. How? By giving men reasons to make them do differently. The history of the past shows that belief does not make men better. We think there is a philosophy which will compel them from within to do right, and that is what this search will reveal. It will reveal underneath all these religions this one diamond which shows its light through them all; then all men can perceive it, then there will no longer be any necessity for the Theosophical Society, or for either creed or church; it will simply be truth and the people will know.

Look fairly and squarely at Christianity. I am simply asking you to consider facts. Here we have Jesus saying: Worship in secret. The Christians do not do it. Then there are all the different

and contradictory statements made by the same religion. How can churches have the enormous cathedrals, the immense wealth, the cannons and soldiers in their possession, if they are the representatives of Christ? How can that be possible unless men are running after creeds and not truth? Even in the words of Jesus is to be found everything we want. I simply repeat to you that old truth taught by him long ago, for to find out the truth in respect to ethics is the chief object of the Theosophical Society, and to establish by Universal Brotherhood a basis from which that ethic may be preached, practiced, and followed without any mistake.

Therefore, then, we ask you this: You have seen us here and you have seen our heathen; some of them are now on the platform. We would like to know what you think of our heathen, and what you think of this heathen Society that has been so much abused? Is it a Society for spiritualism, for wonders, or for folly? It is here to talk common sense and not merely to talk about H. P. Blavatsky, a woman who is dead, but who was the grandest woman or man that I ever knew. It is not for that. It is to bring back the truth about the soul, which truth these heathens represent as well as we, and they themselves are just as much in error as we. They do not know much more about it than we do. But these poor heathens have in their philosophy a little better statement of the truth than we have been able to invent. So I would ask you to wipe out of your mind that hymn which has done so much harm to Christian men and women, which reads:

> What though the spicy breezes
> Blow soft o'er Ceylon's isle,
> Where every prospect pleases,
> And only man is vile.

Wipe that idea completely out with a sponge, and then you will see that we are all brothers and that by tolerating each other, by looking into each other's beliefs, not setting up creeds and dogmas, we shall at last realize that great ideal germ of perfection—human brotherhood—which object has equally engaged the attention of the great Initiates of all the human race.

letters • questions • comment

In a recent discussion of the subject of hypnotism, the question arose: Was Anton Mesmer a real benefactor of the race, as Theosophists seem to think, or was he a charlatan who played upon human credulity, as the French Academy made him out to be? What is the basis for the phenomena of Mesmerism and Hypnotism? Is there any truth in the assertion that Mesmer belonged to a high Order of Being, and was commissioned by this Order to unveil, at a cyclic point in history, some of the deeper truths of Nature?

Mesmer and his works and teachings should be studied from two points of view—the philosophical and the practical; the philosophical, because he founded in France in 1783 the Order of Universal Harmony; the practical, because he taught actual healing. In this Order, one might suppose, only animal magnetism was taught. But in reality very ancient tenets were expounded—those of the Greek Asclepieia, those of the Paracelsians—in short, the occult sciences. "Universal Harmony" is but another name for Brotherhood, the fact of spiritual identity. And though the avenue of the Teaching was through animal magnetism, or "Mesmerism," Anton Mesmer was himself, we are told, an Initiate. He had been selected by the "Council of Luxor" in Egypt, according to orders from the "Great Brotherhood," to act as one of those messengers sent in the last quarter of every century to enlighten a small portion of the Western nations in occult lore. During this period it was recorded that Count St. Germain supervised the developments and Cagliostro was later commissioned to help.

Two factors deserve special notice in an investigation of hypnotism and mesmerism: first, the existence in Nature of a supersensuous electrical fluid, called the *Universal Agent;* second, the omnipotence of the human Will. Early in his career, Mesmer postulated the existence of an "all-pervasive substance," a fluid subtler than any fluid hitherto known to man, which is capable of penetrating all organic and inorganic matter, and which animates and

exhilarates all life. H. P. Blavatsky calls Mesmer the *re-discoverer* only of that Universal Agent "which underlies all magic and has produced at all ages the so-called miracles." Plato and Pythagoras referred to this "agent" as the *Soul of the World,* while the Hindus say it is Deity in the shape of *Akasa* or *Æther,* pervading all things. It is "living fire," the Universal *Proteus.* Another name—*Magnes* —indicates its magical properties and shows its magical nature. It is from the term *Magnes* that the Magi, the practical magicians of Chaldea (of whom Mesmer was one in a long line of succession), derived their name. From that root comes the English terms *magnet* and *magic.*

In Occult Science, mesmerism is one of the most important branches of magic. The thaumaturgists, or miracle-workers, in all ages, performed their magic by controlling the currents of the Astral Light, guiding them with their will-power. Their wonders were both physical and psychological in character—producing effects upon material objects, on the one hand, upon the mind and psychic nature, on the other.

Genuine "miracles," from Moses to Cagliostro, are in perfect accordance with natural Law—hence no *miracles.* Electricity and magnetism were unquestionably used in their production. The mysterious *potency* contained in a simple magnet underlies all the theurgic mysteries. This same potency explains the occult faculties possessed by ancient and modern wonder-workers, as well as a good many of their most astounding achievements. It is all on the basis of Law; and the phenomena to be witnessed in Siam, India, Egypt, and other countries bear no relationship whatever to "sleight of hand."

True magic, says Theosophy, is spiritual wisdom. He who would acquire superhuman powers must possess—not merely profess—faith, love and hope. In *virtue,* a secret power lies concealed—a power which may flower later into wisdom, or magic. Necessarily, then, whatever the world may consider as "magic" must have, besides its terrestrial side, also its celestial. This is why the ancient Asclepieia said that "after the distribution of *pure fire* in the Samothracian Mysteries a new life began—a 'new birth'."

Animal magnetism, the creative and life-giving force, was the principal agent anciently used by the initiated priests who healed diseases by magnetic processes. Paracelsus and Van Helmont agree that "pure primeval magic does not consist in superstitious prac-

tices and vain ceremonies, but in the imperial WILL of man. This magic power of man, which can operate externally, lies as it were hidden in the inner man . . . the magical wisdom and strength thus sleeps, but can be roused into activity and becomes more living, the more the outer man of flesh and the darkness is repressed, bringing back to the soul that magical yet natural strength which had left it." Such active WILL is a state of dynamic equilibrium and, as Paracelsus says, is "imperial." It rouses into action those powers and faculties which sleep.

A French physician once said: "If magnetism were true, medicine would be an absurdity." Commenting, H. P. Blavatsky replied: *"Magnetism is true,* so make of medicine what you will." But for the magnetic healer who would practically apply the Universal Fluid for truly beneficent purposes, long, severe training lies ahead. An intimate practical knowledge of magnetism and electricity, their qualities, correlations and potencies, and a familiarity with their effects upon the animal kingdom and man is especially necessary. There are occult properties in minerals and plants of which so-called exact science is only beginning to suspect the existence.

Mesmer studied, taught, and practiced only the "white" side of Magic. The great question then, as now, of course, is whether there is or is not any actual fluid thrown off by the mesmerizer. Many deny it or refuse to admit it. But Theosophy declares that there is such a fluid, and those who can see into the plane to which it belongs declare its existence as *a subtle form of matter*. But there are many degrees of its expression. These degrees were delineated in Mesmer's school or doctrine. His *Maxims on Animal Magnetism* will be found to range from general principles to detail of processes. It treats of Cohesion, Elasticity, Gravity, Fire, Flux and Reflux, Electricity, Sensation, Instinct, Nervous Diseases, and a summary on Magnetic Treatment *per se*. There is little doubt that the higher aspects of his teachings were never written down.

Fluidity, he said, is "matter in movement." Cessation of movement in matter produces *Solidity*. If a quantity of fluid is set in motion in one direction, that is called a *current*. Currents themselves can be subdivided into magnetic streams "if we suppose a current which insinuates itself into a body, dividing itself into an infinite number of small currents, infinitely tenuous, in a pattern of lines. . . ." Again, all bodies submerged in a fluid are obedient to the movement of that fluid. And "the cause of the apparent attraction

and repulsion is in the direction of the current's coming and going."

For a patient to receive benefit, there must be the capacity to receive. And "this faculty or property of man of being susceptible to all these (varied) relations—human, terrestrial, celestial—to which one is subject, because subject to the Universal Fluid—is what is called *Magnetism*."

It is apparent that the magnetic healer operates by touching certain centers, to impart the fluid, and to restore the natural equilibrium, the disturbance of which is called *Disease*. "The nerves are the best conductors of Magnetism which exist in the body. Most abundant and sensible are the nervous centers of the diaphragm, the solar plexus, umbilicus, etc." To this might be added the statement of Wm. Q. Judge concerning the inner astral currents: "They move in relation to such great centers in the body outside, as the heart, pit of the throat, umbilical centre, spleen, and sacral plexus." The place to look for an explanation of Mesmerism, said Mr. Judge, is in the astral body.

Mesmer discovered that the senses and organs of his patients in their various conditions of abnormality, in stages of nervous disease, exhibited extra-sensory perception—ESP. The skin, for example, would appear to such sight as a sieve, showing texture of muscles and joints plainly. Applied to the ear, sounds could be heard long in advance of their approach, as a band playing and soldiers marching. Flavors in foods compounded in one dish could be separately perceived and savored; in smell, the slightest odors could be individually distinguished at great distances, even through closed doors. These are only minor details, and Mesmer appraised them simply as a means to individual self-search and analysis.

According to Theosophical teaching, all the senses have their seats in the astral body, and every such sense is a thousand-fold more extensive in range than their outer representatives, or sense organs. The inner astral organs have their own currents and circulation, corresponding to the physical nerves; every correspondent is there to be found. "The astro-spinal column of this body has three great astro-nerves; they may be called ways or channels up and down which the forces play, and it is these that enable man, inside and outside, to stand erect, to move, feel and act. In description, they answer exactly to the magnetic fluids. . . ."

Finally, it should be realized that hypnotism and mesmerism are

opposites. Mesmerism operates upon the patient from *within outward,* leaving the patient at all times in complete possession of his Will. Hypnotism, on the other hand, is repressive, in that it operates *from without within,* thus interfering with the will-power of the individual acted upon. In either case, what is needed is knowledge, and the questioner should study the teachings of Theosophy.

Anton Mesmer met the fate of all those who try to enlighten the race. The famous Investigation of 1784, headed by Benjamin Franklin, was a fraud. Mesmer, himself, was not in Paris at the time, and it was the practices of a certain Dr. Deslon, which practices Mesmer had disavowed, that were examined—certainly not Mesmer's theory of *Animal Magnetism.*

THE FINAL AUTHORITY

Our municipal life, our national life, our political life, are all under suggestion, and few are they who try to go to the root of things and understand what the nature of being is, so that they can know for themselves and thus act with power and knowledge. As we look the field over, we find that we are all prey to the power of suggestion in every direction.

What is the criterion which we should apply to every suggestion presented to us? Just this: If we have the truth, it will explain what was before a mystery. And as we are surrounded by mysteries, the Truth must explain them all.

This power of suggestion must still be used, whatever line may be pointed out to us. If Truth exists and is possible to us—the Truth in religion, science and philosophy—it must first come to us by suggestion from Those who know. If it were not possible for this to be done, were not possible for us to avail ourselves of it, then there would be no use talking of these things. But when the true is suggested to us, there is always a means presented by which we may see and verify it. That means is not in anyone's authority or endorsement, but in the fact that we can perceive it and test it for ourselves. *The final authority is the man himself.*

—ROBERT CROSBIE

THE CHRISTIAN SCHEME

Gnosis and Christianity: Oriental Kabala

THE "Christ," then, and the "Logos" existed ages before Christianity; the Oriental Gnosis was studied long before the days of Moses, and we have to seek for the origin of all there in the archaic periods of the primeval Asiatic philosophy. Peter's second Epistle and Jude's fragment, preserved in the New Testament, show by their phraseology that they belong to the kabalistic Oriental Gnosis, for they use the same expressions as did the Christian Gnostics who built a part of their system from the Oriental *Kabala*. "Presumptuous are they (the Ophites), self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of Dignities," says Peter (II Pet. 2:10), the original model for the later abusive Tertullian and Irenæus. "Likewise (even as Sodom and Gomorrah) also these *filthy* dreamers defile the flesh, despise Dominion and speak evil of Dignities," says Jude, repeating the very words of Peter, and thereby expressions consecrated in the *Kabala*. *Dominion* is the "Empire," the *tenth* of the kabalistic sephiroth.[1] The *Powers* and Dignities are the subordinate genii of the Archangels and Angels of the *Sohar*. (According to the *Kabala, Empire* or *Dominion* is "the consuming fire, and his wife is the Temple or the Church.") These emanations are the very life and soul of the *Kabala* and Zoroastranism; and the *Talmud* itself, in its present state, is all borrowed from the *Zend-Avesta*. Therefore, by adopting the views of Peter, Jude, and other Jewish apostles, the Christians have become but a dissenting sect of the Persians, for they do not even interpret the meaning of all such *Powers* as the true kabalists do. Paul's warning his converts against the worshipping of angels, shows how well he appreciated, even so early as his period,

---

Note.—"The Christian Scheme," begun in November 1967, is collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky. It recounts the historical background and early development of Christianity.

[1] The types of the creation, or the attributes of the Supreme Being, are through the emanations of Adam Kadmon; these are: "The *Crown, Wisdom, Prudence, Magnificence, Severity, Beauty, Victory, Glory, Foundation, Empire*. Wisdom is called *Jeh;* Prudence, *Jehovah;* Severity, *Elohim;* Magnificence, *El;* Victory and Glory, Sabaoth; Empire or Dominion, Adonai." Thus when the Nazarenes and other Gnostics of the more Platonic tendency twitted the Jews as "abortions who worship their god Iurbo, *Adunai*," we need not wonder at the wrath of those who had accepted the old Mosaic system, but at that of Peter and Jude who claim to be followers of Jesus and dissent from the views of him who was also a Nazarene.

the dangers of borrowing from a metaphysical doctrine the philosophy of which could be rightly interpreted but by its well-learned adherents, the Magi and the Jewish Tanaïm. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and *worshipping of angels,* intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind," is a sentence laid right at the door of Peter and his champions. In the *Talmud,* Michael is Prince of Water, who has *seven* inferior spirits subordinate to him. He is the patron, the guardian angel of the Jews, as Daniel informs us (5:21), and the Greek Ophites, who identified him with their Ophiomorphos, the personified creation of the envy and malice of Ilda-Baoth, the Demiurgus (Creator of the *material* world), and undertook to prove that he was also Samael, the Hebrew prince of the evil spirits, or Persian devs, were naturally regarded by the Jews as blasphemers. But did Jesus ever sanction this belief in angels except in so far as hinting that they were the messengers and subordinates of God? And here the origin of the later splits between Christian beliefs is directly traceable to these two early contradictory views.

Paul, believing in all such occult powers in the world "unseen," but ever "present," says: "Ye walked according to the ÆON of this world, according to the *Archon* (Ilda-Baoth, the *Demiurg*) that has the domination of the air," and "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the *dominations,* the *powers;* the lords of darkness, the mischievousness of spirits in the upper regions." This sentence, "Ye were dead in sin and error," for "ye walked according to the *Archon,"* or Ilda-Baoth, the God and creator of matter of the Ophites, shows unequivocally that: 1st, Paul, notwithstanding some dissensions with the more important doctrines of the Gnostics, shared more or less their cosmogonical views on the emanations; and 2nd, that he was fully aware that this Demiurge, whose Jewish name was Jehovah, was *not* the God preached by Jesus. And now, if we compare the doctrine of Paul with the religious views of Peter and Jude, we find that, not only did they worship Michael, the Archangel, but that also they *reverenced* SATAN, because the latter was also, before his fall, an angel! This they do quite openly, and abuse the Gnostics[2] for speaking "evil" of him. No one can deny the following: Peter, when denouncing those who are not afraid to speak evil of *"dignities,"* adds immediately, "Whereas angels, which are

[2] It is more likely that both abused Paul, who preached against this belief; and that the Gnostics were only a pretext. (See Peter's second Epistle.)

greater in power and might, *bring not railing accusations* against them (the dignities) before the Lord" (II Pet. 2:11). Who are the dignities? Jude, in his general epistle, makes the word as clear as day. The *dignities* are the DEVILS!! Complaining of the disrespect shown by the Gnostics to the *powers* and *dominions,* Jude argues in the very words of Peter: "And yet, Michael, the Archangel, when contending *with the devil,* he disputed about the body of Moses, *durst not bring against him a railing accusation,* but said, The Lord rebuke thee" (1:9). Is this plain enough? If not, then we have the *Kabala* to prove who were the *dignities.*

Considering that Deuteronomy tells us that the *"Lord"* Himself buried Moses in a valley of Moab (34:6), "and no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day," this biblical *lapsus linguæ* of Jude gives a strong coloring to the assertions of some of the Gnostics. They claimed but what was secretly taught by the Jewish kabalists themselves; to wit: that the highest supreme God was unknown and invisible; "the King of Light is a closed eye"; that Ilda-Baoth, the Jewish second Adam, was the real Demiurge; and that Iao, Adonai, Sabaoth, and Eloi were the quaternary emanation which formed the unity of the God of the Hebrews—Jehovah. Moreover, the latter was also called Michael and Samael by them, and regarded but as an angel, several removes from the Godhead. In holding to such a belief, the Gnostics countenanced the teachings of the greatest of the Jewish doctors, Hillel, and other Babylonian divines. Josephus shows the great deference of the official Synagogue in Jerusalem to the wisdom of the schools of Central Asia. The colleges of Sora, Pumbiditha, and Nahaidea were considered the headquarters of esoteric and theological learning by all the schools of Palestine. The Chaldean version of the Pentateuch, made by the well-known Babylonian divine, Onkelos, was regarded as the most authoritative of all, and it is according to this learned Rabbi that Hillel and other Tanaïm after him held that the Being who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, on Mount Siani, and who finally buried him, was the *angel* of the Lord, Memro, and not the Lord Himself; and that he whom the Hebrews of the Old Testament mistook for *Iahoh* was but His messenger, one of His sons, or emanations. All this establishes but one logical conclusion—namely, that the Gnostics were by far the superiors of the disciples, in point of education and general information; even in a knowledge of the religious tenets of the Jews themselves. While they were perfectly well-versed in the Chaldean

wisdom, the well-meaning, pious but fanatical as well as ignorant disciples, unable to fully understand or grasp the religious spirit of their own system, were driven in their disputations to such convincing logic as the use of "brute beasts," "sows," "dogs," and other epithets so freely bestowed by Peter.

Since then, the epidemic has reached the apex of the sacerdotal hierarchy. From the day when the founder of Christianity uttered the warning, that he who shall say to his brother, "Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire," all who have passed as its leaders, beginning with the ragged fishermen of Galilee, and ending with the jewelled pontiffs, have seemed to vie with each other in the invention of opprobrious epithets for their opponents. So we find Luther passing a final sentence on the Catholics, and exclaiming that "The Papists are all asses, put them in whatever form you like; whether they are boiled, roasted, baked, fried, skinned, hashed, they will be always the same asses." Calvin called the victims he persecuted, and occasionally burned, "malicious barking dogs, full of bestiality and insolence, base corrupters of the sacred writings," etc. Dr. Warburton terms the Popish religion "an impious farce," and Monseigneur Dupanloup asserts that the Protestant Sabbath service is the "Devil's mass," and all clergymen are "thieves and ministers of the Devil."

The same spirit of incomplete inquiry and ignorance has led the Christian Church to bestow on its most holy apostles, titles assumed by their most desperate opponents, the "Hæretics" and Gnostics. So we find, for instance, Paul termed the vase of election *"Vas Electionis,"* a title chosen by *Manes,*[3] the greatest heretic of his day in the eyes of the Church, Manes meaning, in the Babylonian language, the chosen vessel or receptacle.

Christian theology, getting the doctrine of the archangels and angels directly from the Oriental *Kabala,* of which the Mosaic Bible is but an allegorical screen, ought at least to remember the hierarchy invented by the former for these personified emanations. The hosts of the Cherubim and Seraphim, with which we generally see the Catholic Madonnas surrounded in their pictures, belong, together with the Elohim and Beni Elohim of the Hebrews, to the *third* kabalistic world, *Jezirah.* This world is but one remove higher than

[3] The true name of Manes—who was a Persian by birth—was *Cubricus.* He was flayed alive at the instance of the Magi, by the Persian King Varanes I. Plutarch says that Manes or Manis means Masses or ANOINTED. The vessel, or vase of election, is, therefore, the vessel full of that light of God, which he pours on one he has selected for his interpreter.

Asiah, the fourth and lowest world, in which dwell the grossest and most material beings—the *klippoth,* who delight in evil and mischief, and whose chief is *Belial!*

In the religious metaphysics of the Hebrews, the Highest One is an abstraction; he is "without form or being," "with no likeness with anything else." And even Philo calls the Creator, the *Logos* who stands next God, "the SECOND GOD." "The *second* God who is his WISDOM." God is NOTHING, he is nameless, and therefore called *Ain-Soph*—the word *Ain* meaning *nothing.* But if, according to the older Jews, Jehovah is *the* God, and He manifested Himself several times to Moses and the prophets, and the Christian Church anathematized the Gnostics who denied the fact—how comes it, then, that we read in the fourth gospel that *"No man hath seen God* AT ANY TIME, but the *only-begotten* Son . . . he hath declared him"? The very words of the Gnostics, in spirit and substance. This sentence of St. John—or rather whoever wrote the gospel now bearing his name—floors all the Petrine arguments against Simon Magus, without appeal. The words are repeated and emphasized in chapter 6: *"Not that any man hath seen the Father,* save he which is of God, he (Jesus) hath seen the Father" (46)—the very objection brought forward by Simon in the *Homilies.* These words prove that either the author of the fourth evangel had no idea of the existence of the *Homilies,* or that he was *not* John, the friend and companion of Peter, whom he contradicts point-blank with this emphatic assertion. Be it as it may, this sentence, like many more that might be profitably cited, blends Christianity completely with the Oriental Gnosis, and hence with the KABALA.

While the doctrines, ethical code, and observances of the Christian religion were all appropriated from Brahmanism and Buddhism, its ceremonials, vestments, and pageantry were taken bodily from Lamaism. The Romish monastery and nunnery are almost servile copies of similar religious houses in Tibet and Mongolia, and interested explorers of Buddhist lands, when obliged to mention the unwelcome fact, have had no other alternative left them but, with an anachronism unsurpassed in recklessness, to charge the offense of plagiarism upon the religious system their own mother Church had despoiled. This makeshift has served its purpose and had its day.

on the lookout

Lower Manas in Custom

Little by little, with slow increments of insight, modern thought seems to be grasping in a practical way the distinction between higher and lower *manas*. This is to be seen most of all in the growing interest in the creative processes of the mind, and in renewed recognition of the importance of the imagination. But the understanding is also apparent in discussions of the rule of custom and the domination of habit. The institutions of society, unless deliberately held "open" by independent thinking, invariably fall into settled habits, representing the line of least resistance. Constructive innovation must always contend against these habits—a pattern comparatively easy to discern in the practice of the professions, where convention, save for the exceptional man, rules supreme. A critical article on practice of the law, in the *Saturday Review* for Aug. 3, by Arthur Selwyn Miller, will illustrate.

After Problems Erupt

Mr. Miller says:

> Law has been viewed mainly through the eyes of what Holmes called the "bad man"—the person who asks what adverse consequences will happen if a certain thing is done—rather than instrumentally, as a device to effect social change. Lawyers wait until problems erupt before doing anything, and then what they do is litigate or negotiate.
>
> The automobile safety situation provides illustration. There, the way in which safety matters were handled was through the medium of a tort action, of the person hurt suing someone for damages. It was not until 1966 that the slaughter on the highways had reached proportions significant enough to get federal safety regulations issued. That they came after the widely publicized activities of one lawyer, Ralph Nader, is no credit to the legal profession. It was Nader's tenacity that won the day, not his ability as a lawyer.

Attention to Effects

This deficiency in law has another aspect: Lawyers tend to look on social problems as discrete social instances, rather than seeking to guide the manner in which policies evolve in legislation and administration. Automobile safety, to them, was a matter of a host of individual accidents, not a question of what should be done affirmatively to ameliorate an obviously bad and worsening situation. The same tendency may be seen in many other areas. To cite but two—lawyers are apparently waiting for actual damage from sonic boom before trying to do anything about supersonic transport (it has been left to a scientist, Dr. William Shurcliff of Harvard, to mount a campaign to fight sonic boom *politically*), and lawyers *qua* lawyers are doing nothing about environmental pollution.

Neglect of Moral Values

So that "lawyers" do not bear the entire brunt of this criticism, we may recall that, a little over a year ago, the *Saturday Review* (July 1, 1967) published a strong complaint by J. Herbert Hollomon, a deputy secretary in the Department of Commerce, holding the profession of engineers responsible in exactly the same way. Mr. Hollomon said:

It is a travesty, in my view, that engineers are responsible for the design of vehicles in which so many people are killed or maimed. It is a travesty that engineers are responsible for the design of plants that pollute our atmosphere and our streams. Engineers must feel a sense of moral values through which they weigh the consequences for good of their work and make some judgments between them.

Higher Mind

Concern for others, and use of the synthesizing power of the imagination to anticipate human need, instead of waiting for disaster to become oppressively objective—these are surely aspects of the higher mind. In her article, "Dialogue Between the Two Editors," Madame Blavatsky wrote:

. . . the plastic power of the imagination is much stronger in some persons than in others. The mind is dual in its potentiality: it is physical and metaphysical. The higher part of the mind is connected with the spiritual soul or Buddhi, the lower with the animal soul, the Kama principle. There are persons who never think with the higher faculties of their mind at all; those who do so are the minority and are thus, in a way, *beyond*, if not above, the average of human kind. These will think upon ordinary matters on that *higher* plane. The idiosyncracy of the person de-

termines in which "principle" of the mind the thinking is done, as also the faculties of a preceding life, and sometimes the heredity of the physical. This is why it is so very difficult for the materialist—the metaphysical portion of whose brain is almost atrophied—to raise himself, or for one who is naturally spiritually minded, to descend to the level of the matter-of-fact vulgar thought. . . . The person who is endowed with this faculty of thinking about even the most trifling things from the higher plane of thought has, by virtue of that gift which he possesses, a plastic power of formation, so to say, in his very imagination. Whatever such a person may think about, his thought will be so far more intense than the thought of an ordinary person, that by this very intensity it obtains the power of creation.

Path to Discovery

The traits of the self-actualizing person, as described by A. H. Maslow, seem to approximate some of the workings of higher manas. Studies of how scientific discoveries come to be made are a similar contribution. There is also the consolidating, verifying sort of science, necessary and useful, but great advances in knowledge take place when original thinkers break out of the confinements of the presently known. As Einstein said when asked by a Cal Tech professor how he arrived at his Theory of Relativity: "By refusing to accept an axiom." This is never the style of lower manas. And the eminent scientist René Dubos wrote recently:

Biology will run dry unless it becomes more receptive than it is presently to unsuspected phenomena, unpredictable on the basis of what is already known. Science does not progress only by inductive, analytical knowledge. The imaginative speculations of the mind come first, the verification and the analytical breakdown come only later.

Sacrifice to Systems

This sequence in invention and discovery is beginning to be a matter of common understanding. As a professor of literature, Wylie Sypher, put it in an article in the Winter 1967-68 *American Scholar*:

[The] first time the astronomer feels his wild surmise he is a poet, and the poetry in science is this instant of revelation or epiphany. Then his discovery must be *reduced* before it is reliable science. So Bachelard [a French physicist] describes science as a way of organizing our disappointments under the guise of knowledge. Knowledge in scientific form is coherent disillusion, a sacrifice of discoveries to concepts and systems, a loss of an epiphany.

The searching, intuitive reaches of the original mind are often far more valuable than the logic of closed intellectual and scientific systems. H.P.B. remarks that "great intellectual powers are often no proof of, but are impediments to spiritual and right conceptions; witness most of the great men of science"—and in this case "great" must refer to "established authorities," and not to the Keplers and the Newtons. Those who rest secure in the comfortable systems devised by the lower mind to shut out disturbing change usually resist the leaps of new discovery, which must begin with flights of the imagination. The workings of the higher mind do not depend on memory, although memories may serve as the raw materials of such thought. The imagination uses, but is not controlled by, memory.

Unwillingness to Question

As Maslow puts it (in *The Psychology of Science*):

> *This is a stage through which knowledge must pass!* There is no known alternative. There is no other way to do things.
>
> If this fact is fully understood, we are apt to turn back on critics with some irritation. . . . For at this point we realize that the critics often *need* neatness, exactness, or precision and cannot tolerate its absence, that they select only those problems to work with that already satisfy that criterion, and that in effect their criticisms may amount to a rejection of the problems themselves. They may be criticizing not your methodology but you yourself for asking that particular question.

Lurking Contradictions

All endeavors to create closed systems of thought, one might say, reflect the passivity and defensiveness of lower manas. Such a system has long been the aspiration of organized science, and it is interesting that one of the breakthroughs of modern mathematics has had the effect of declaring that the objective of a complete closed system of science is impossible to attain. This discovery has been well described by the English mathematician, J. Bronowski, in the *American Scholar* for the Spring of 1966. Arguing from the work of Godël, Tarski, and Church, Bronowski says:

> . . . an axiomatic system can never be guaranteed to be consistent: any day, some flagrant and irreconcilable contradiction may turn up in it. An axiomatic system cannot be made to generate a description of the world which matches it fully, point by point; at some points there will be holes which cannot be filled in by deduction, and at other points two opposite deductions may turn up.

The Logic of the Mind

Changes in scientific systems come quite unpredictably, as Bronowski points out, and these changes are always a form of self-reference, a return to the originator outside the system, who adds something new to it. Thus, no more than science could a computer provide a closed and final system of knowledge:

> . . . the brain as a machine is certainly not the kind of a machine that we understand now. It is not a logical machine, because no logical machine can reach out of the difficulties and paradoxes created by self-reference. The logic of the mind differs from formal logic in its ability to overcome and indeed to exploit the ambivalences of self-reference, so that they become instruments of imagination.

We might think of the self-reference to which Bronowski refers as a kind of touching of home-base by the mind—a return to the egoic center for the purposes of new vision and discovery. So, here, again, we have practical intimations of the difference between higher and lower mind.

Decline of Individuality

In *Lucifer* for May of 1891, the month of her death, one of H.P.B.'s last articles appeared—"Civilization, the Death of Art and Beauty." Only today, after nearly three-quarters of a century of accumulating ugliness, are perceptive writers making similar comments concerning the inroads of industrialism and the effects of technology on the arts. She wrote:

> . . . if there are any true lovers of art left . . . , why do they not organize and send out missionaries the world over, to tell picturesque Japan and other countries ready to fall victim that, to imitate the will-o'-the-wisp of European culture and fascination, means for a non-Christian land, the committing of suicide; that it means sacrificing one's individuality for an empty show and shadow; at best it is to exchange the original and the picturesque for the vulgar and the hideous. Truly and indeed it is high time that at last something should be done in this direction, and before the deceitful civilization of the conceited nations of but yesterday has irretrievably hypnotized the older races, and made them succumb to its upas-tree wiles and supposed superiority. Otherwise, old arts and artistic creations, everything original and unique will very soon disappear. Already national dresses and time-honoured customs, and everything beautiful, artistic, and worth preserving is fast disappearing from view. At no distant day, alas, the best relics of the past will perhaps be found only

in museums in sorry, solitary, and be-ticketed samples preserved under glass!

"Monotony and Dissonance"

As though to confirm this melancholy prediction, the Museum of Modern Art in New York, a little more than three years ago (1964-65), gave an exhibition entitled "Architecture Without Architects," showing through photographs the beauty and simplicity of dwellings and other buildings naturally evolved by peoples all over the world. The caption for pictures of fifteenth-century vaulted ceilings erected in the Masjid-e-Jameh at Isfahan, Persia, mourns the loss of the spontaneous inventiveness of old craftsmen:

> "Give a mason bricks and mortar," writes Jamshid Kooros, an M.I.T.-educated Persian architect, "and tell him to cover a space and let in light, and the results are astounding. The mason, within his limitations, finds unending possibilities, there is variety and harmony; while the modern architect with all the materials and structural systems available to him produces monotony and dissonance, and that in great abundance."

Ecological Disaster

Another of H.P.B.'s observations in the same article is equally pertinent:

> Owing to the triumphant march and invasion of civilization, Nature, as well as man and ethics, is sacrificed, and is fast becoming artificial. Climates are changing, and the face of the whole world will soon be altered. Under the murderous hand of the pioneers of civilization, the destruction of whole primeval forests is leading to the drying up of rivers. .. . A few years more and there will not remain within a radius of fifty miles around our large cities one single rural spot inviolate from vulgar inspection. In scenery, the picturesque and the natural is daily replaced by the grotesque and the artificial. Scarce a landscape in England but the fair body of nature is desecrated by the advertisements of "Pear's Soap" and "Beecham's Pills." The pure air of the country is polluted with smoke, the smells of greasy railway-engines, and the sickening odours of gin, whiskey, and beer. And once that every natural spot in the surrounding scenery is gone, and the eye of the painter finds but the artificial and hideous products of modern civilization to rest upon, artistic taste will have to follow suit and disappear along with them.

Galloping Urban Sprawl

While this general effect is now visible all over the United States, it has reached appalling dimensions in California. In an essay titled

"Life in the Instant Cities" (in *The California Revolution,* edited by Carey McWilliams, Grossman, 1968), Theodore Roszak calls the once magnificent Pacific coast running south along the San Francisco Peninsula "an unsightly scab of congested tracts and slurb-lined freeway." He says further:

> . . . urban sprawl and blight seem to be far more hideously advanced in California than any place else on earth. Or perhaps that is only an illusion created by one's constant realization that this is quite simply one of the loveliest pieces of landscape and climate in the world. There is so much natural beauty to be destroyed in California—and it *is* being destroyed before one's eyes with a grim nihilistic insistence that approaches the demonic. It is almost as if California had been created to demonstrate how boorish and wantonly wasteful human beings can be: a beautiful face on which the scars of a sadistic crime can show more vividly. Day by day, one can observe the decay spreading —and it spreads from the cities, traveling at a mile-a-minute along the great highways that lie across the land like welts on a beaten body. The groves and woods, seascapes and gentle hills are mercilessly planed away and squared off to make for exotically named tracts of pastel-colored cracker-box homes clustered around a quaint, or folksy, or garish shopping center that is always the same assemblage of chain store operations. And between the tracts, along the highways, like cancer seeping along the lymph ducts of a stricken organism, the "slurb" sets in: a billboarded and neon-lit honky-tonk of gas stations, hot dog stands, drive-in movies, secondhand tire stores, junk-yards, pizza parlors, motels. . . . Then, soon enough, the smog comes, settling in like an act of ecological incorporation that makes the tract or town an official part of California urban life.

Change for the Worse

One might append a comment by H.P.B.:

> But these are only trifling signs of the time and the spread of *culture* among the middle and lower classes. Wherever the spirit of aping possesses the heart of the nation—the poor working classes—there the elements of nationality disappear and the country is on the eve of losing its individuality and all things for the worse.

At the root of these excrescences, now displayed so widely as signs of "progress," is the worship of money and power. The environment-makers of our time are victims and propagators of the infection, along with many others. As Bernard Rudolfsky says in the Preface to *Architecture Without Architects,* even conventional histories of architecture reflect this corruption. To begin with, a

modern vanity suppresses the greatness of the past:

> Skipping the first fifty centuries, chroniclers present us with a full-dress pageant of "formal" architecture, as arbitrary a way of introducing the art of building as, say, dating the birth of music with the advent of the symphony orchestra. . . . Besides, architectural history as we know it is equally biased on the social plane. It amounts to little more than a who's who of architects who commemorated power and wealth; an anthology of buildings of, by, and for the privileged—the houses of true and false gods, of merchant princes and princes of the blood—with never a word about the houses of lesser people.

Thoreau on Architecture

Behind the egotisms of the times and the acquisitive exploitation of nature lies the ethical failure of Western thought, with its indifference to the springs of true civilization in brotherly attitudes and devotion to philosophy. A guide for reforms in environment-making might well be found in Thoreau's idea that the principles of American architecture should be sought in habitations of the utmost simplicity —the huts of loggers, the houses of the poor, and above all in nature. The most uncompromising of nature-lovers, Thoreau had hardly completed his thoughts about architecture when he decided that at best a house is a sort of "hospital" where man suffers the ills of civilization, adding that if he would be really sane he must return to nature. And then, impatient even of great monuments, he exclaimed: "How much more admirable the *Bhagavat-Geeta* than all the ruins of the East!" It is from such sources, indeed, that the modern world will learn its necessary reforms.

"Time" Makes Careless Mistakes

Many students of Theosophy doubtless noticed *Time's* article of July 19, which repeated old falsehoods about Madame Blavatsky and offered meaningless and frivolous commentary on random passages from *The Secret Doctrine*. *Time* received many letters objecting to and correcting this article, but has apparently not had the integrity to print any of them. One of these letters said in part:

> While *Time* readers are able to correct the light-hearted and out-of-key distortions in your description of Madame Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* by reading the book themselves, the ancient slander that "she gave birth to at least one illegitimate son" requires refutation. This is easy. The charge originated with jealous personal enemies of Madame Blavatsky and was flatly disproved, during her lifetime, by the medical certificate of an

examining gynecologist, to the effect that a congenital condition made it absolutely impossible for her to bear a child. . . . As for other imputations of "immorality," *Time's* research staff slipped badly by failing to report that the powerful New York *Sun,* after printing in 1890 a full collection of gossiping slurs and assaults on H.P.B.'s character, was compelled by a libel action to admit in open court that none of the charges could be proved. . . . The *Sun* published a retraction, even though Madame Blavatsky died before the final decision, removing the threat of damages. *Time* ought to do the same, but you could make partial amends by printing this letter.

Letter from London Society for Psychical Research

Interestingly enough, the London Society for Psychical Research, whose committee originated the infamous "Hodgson Report," has on this occasion finally been moved to withdraw openly its sponsorship of that report. The following letter, dated July 25, was addressed to the editor of *Time* by the Hon. Secretary of the Society:

Dear Sir,

We would like to make a correction to the article on Religion published in the issue of 'Time' dated July 19, 1968.

In this feature, under Theosophy, it is stated in connection with Madame Blavatsky: "Controversial wherever she went, she was accused in 1885 by the Society for Psychical Research in London of fraud, forgery and even of spying for the Czar."

We would point out that, as stated in all copies of the Proceedings of this Society, "Responsibility for both the facts and the reasonings in papers published in the Proceedings rests entirely with the authors."

Comments on Madame Blavatsky were contained in a report by Richard Hodgson in Part IX of Proceedings dated December 1885 and any accusations therein contained are the responsibility of the author and not this organization.

Blavatsky Foundation

This open and published admission has been a long time in coming, during which time the learned society has allowed its name and authority to be associated with charges against H.P.B. that have been thoroughly disproved, when not merely ridiculous, such as the "Russian spy" nonsense. Lookout has learned that this letter from the Society for Psychical Research was written to *Time* at the suggestion of Walter A. Carrithers, Jr., of Fresno, California, who has been active for years in the defense of H. P. Blavatsky's name and reputation, and who recently formed The Blavatsky Foundation, in Fresno, to pursue this work more effectively.

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No. 95